

09/649,254

MS150961.1

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A clean version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-15. Applicants' representative acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner indicating claims 8 and 9 would be considered allowable if recast in independent form to include all limitations of respective base claim(s) and any intervening claims. It is believed such amendments are not necessary in view of the below-noted deficiencies of the cited references *vis a vis* applicants' claimed invention. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 12 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-2, 12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kanevsky *et al.* (U.S. 6,300,947). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Kanevsky *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "*each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

The present invention relates to a method and apparatus for providing data from a data source to a data consumer and for rendering data from a data provider to an interface. (*See* pg. 1, ln. 6-9). The invention provides for *obtaining, interpreting and rendering data* from a data source.

In accordance with the claimed invention, an origin data request may be sent to a data source prompting an origin response containing two distinct components. In particular, as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly in independent claim 21), the subject invention provides *a first response message having a schema component and a*

09/649,254

MS150961.1

*data component*. Kanevsky *et al.* does not teach or suggest such claimed features of applicants' invention.

Rather, Kanevsky *et al.* teaches systems and methods for *organizing viewing materials*. More particularly, Kanevsky *et al.* is directed to organizing viewing materials associated with web sites on visual display screens and windows on and within which the viewing materials are being viewed. (See col. 1, ln. 6-11). The cited reference discloses a web page adaptation system and method for organization of viewing material associated with web sites in order to visually display the material in accordance with a desired device (e.g., standard PC monitors, web phones, digital cameras). (See Abstract).

As set forth in the subject application, in conventional computer system applications, data from a data source is rendered to an interface according to a presentation format or schema. In a common data binding method, a client application or system receives data of a *known format* from a data source, such as a database or a database management system. The client and the data source are each programmed in accordance with a common data schema. The client renders the data to a user, for example, via a user interface such as a display, by creating a presentation language representation of the data. In these earlier conventional implementations, the data presented to the client is always in the same format, thus allowing the client to render the data to the display in a predictable fashion. (See Background).

One particular novel aspect of applicants' claimed invention is that a response message containing a *schema component and a data component* can be sent by a data provider in accordance to an original request by a data consumer. Unlike prior implementations, the claimed invention provides for receiving the schema or formatting information from the data source as part of a response including the data component.

Applicants' representative respectfully submits, generally, a schema component may be defined as a structure of a database system, described in a formal language supported by a database management system. For example, with reference to a relational database, the schema may define the tables, the fields in each table, and the relationships between fields and tables. Similarly, data may be defined as distinct pieces of information, usually formatted in a specific manner (e.g., schema).

09/649,254

MS150961.1

As illustrated in FIG. 1 of the present application, a schema component (*e.g.*, presentation or format information) related to displaying the information on an interface may be supplied in the response from a data provider. (See pg. 11, ln. 8-10). In other words, in accordance with the claimed invention, the schema component facilitates interpretation of the data format and structure upon rendering to the interface. Thus, once interpreted, the present system may render the data to the interface by generating the appropriate presentation language representation of the data. (See pg. 11, ln. 12-14).

Kanevsky *et al.* fails to teach or suggest *a response message containing a schema component and a data component* as disclosed and claimed in independent claims 1 and 21 of the subject application. Instead, in accordance with Kanevsky *et al.*, simultaneously with the request message to obtain a web page, a client sends a display mode message including characteristics or parameters of the particular client display. (See col. 6, ln. 20-25). In other words, Kanevsky *et al.*, predefines the desired display parameters whereby, as illustrated in FIG. 1, a web page adaptor module and/or server reconfigures the requested web page to conform to the subject display device. Specifically, Kanevsky *et al.* fails to disclose a “schema” portion related to interpretation of data as disclosed and claimed in the subject application.

It is contended in the Office Action dated February 13, 2004 that “Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays web pages—data—from a web page server. The client sends a request message to the server using a URL according to display characteristics of the client (col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67).” The Office Action continues by stating that “Moreover, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, which have information and tags—schema components—on a window—Interface (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67)” (See pg. 3).

Applicants’ representative respectfully disagree with such an assertion. For at least the reasons set forth *supra*, it is submitted that Kanevsky *et al.* does not teach or suggest *a response message having a schema component and a data component*. Furthermore, Kanevsky *et al.* is silent regarding any separate or distinct presentation formatting information or tags received in a response message. Moreover, Kanevsky *et al.* fails to

09/649,254

MS150961.1

disclose any method or schema associated with interpretation of data. Instead, Kanevsky *et al.* simply discloses a system that sends a simultaneous display mode message (*e.g.*, request) containing characteristics or parameters of the client display (*e.g.*, display size) to visually format a web site to a predefined display device.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Kanevsky *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest the subject invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 21 (and claims 2-20 and 22-32 which respectively depend there from). This rejection should be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of Claims 3-7, 10-11, 13-20, and 22-50 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 3-7, 10-11, 13-20, and 22-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky *et al.* in view of Lemay *et al.* ("Laura Lemay's Web Workshop Creating Commercial Webpages", Sams, 8/1996, Chapter 14, and pp. 356-359). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Kanevsky *et al.* nor Lemay *et al.*, individually or in combination, teach or suggest each and every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

Lemay *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kanevsky *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 21 (which claims 2-20 and 22-32 respectively directly or indirectly depend from). Specifically, Lemay *et al.* does not teach or suggest receiving a response message having a *schema component and a data component* as recited in these claims. Additionally, independent claims 33, 39, 41, 43, 45 and 47-50 recite a response having a schema component.

Therefore, the subject invention as recited in claims 3-7, 10-11, 13-20, and 22-50 is not obvious over the combination of Kanevsky *et al.* and Lemay *et al.* Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

09/649,254

MS150961.1

**III. CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Jeffrey R. Sadlowski  
Reg. No. 47,914

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731